| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/583,366 | 06/19/2006 | Arnaud Bailleul | 4590-538 | 8191 |

33308          7590          05/19/2011
LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP
1700 DIAGONAL ROAD, SUITE 300
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| STORK, KYLE R |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2178 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 05/19/2011 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>23 March 2011</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.        2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>10,11 and 13-18</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>10,11 and 13-18</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All  b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

1.      This non-final office action is in response to the remarks filed 23 March 2011.

2.      Claims 10-11 and 13-18 are pending.  Claim 10 is an independent claim.


### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3.      The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.      This application currently names joint inventors.  In considering patentability of

the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of

the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein

were made absent any evidence to the contrary.  Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).


5.      Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *I-

Logix Introduces Wizard-Based Documentation Product for Web Publishing to Facilitate

Team Collaboration* (8 May 2000, hereafter I-Logix), and further in view of Ferrucci et al.

(US 7131057, filed 4 February 2000, hereafter Ferrucci).

As per independent claim 10, I-Logix discloses a method for the production of a description for project data on the basis of a structured model, comprising the following steps:

generating of documentary fragments of the model with a requirements management tool (page 1, paragraph 2: Here, the documentary fragments are generated in the Rhapsody environment)

selecting of the model including the documentary information and of the generator of documentary fragments (page 1, paragraph 3: Here, a customizable template is selected.  This template publishes content from the UML design into an output document in the form of RTF, HTML, Framemaker, and Microsoft® Word® formats (paragraph 2))

inserting of the documentary fragments generated into the documentary structure of the documentary chain  (page 1, paragraphs 1-2: Here, the documentary fragments are inserted into the UML diagrams and code)

inserting the selected fragment at its location in the document (page 1, paragraph 4: Here, based upon the inputs received in the dialog boxes, the appropriate fragments are inserted into the output document)

I-Logix fails to specifically disclose:

opening a document with a text processor

loading of a structured model into a modeling tool

selecting a fragment whose structure echoes the architecture of the packages of the starting model

wherein the structure relates to a tree structure

wherein the update of the documentation is performed with the aid of dynamic links established for each fragment generated between its location in the description for project data and its physical file arising from the automatic documentary generation

Ferrucci discloses:

load a structured model into a modeling tool, thereby allowing a user to select a model to process (column 1, line 57- column 2, line 4)

selecting a fragment whose structure echoes the architecture of the packages of the starting model (column 2, lines 11-20; column 7, lines 38-58)

wherein the structure relates to a tree structure (column 1, line 57- column 2, line 4)

wherein the update of the documentation is performed with the aid of dynamic links established for each fragment generated between its location in the description for project data and its physical file arising from the automatic documentary generation (Figure 1; column 3, lines 5-27; column 5, lines 29-47)

wherein the structure relates to a tree structure (column 1, line 57- column 2, line 4)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Ferrucci with I-Logix, since it would have allowed a user to maintain relations between a model and a generated document after an edit.

The examiner takes official notice that opening a document with a text processor for inserting data was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the applicant's invention. Opening of the document would have allowed a user to select an insertion point for placement of data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined the well known with I-Logix, since it would have allowed a user to specify an insertion point for data.

As per dependent claim 11, I-Logix discloses wherein the structured model is a UML model (page 1, paragraph 2).


6.      Claims 13 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over I-Logix and Ferrucci and further in view of "Bringing It All Together" (July 2002, hereafter BIAT).

As per dependent claim 13, I-Logix and Ferrucci disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. I-Logix discloses use of the Rhapsody tool (page 1, paragraph 2). However, I-Logix fails to specifically disclose wherein the model is produced with the aid of the "RHAPSODY" tool and that "RHAPSODY-DOC" is used to generate the documentary fragments that one desires to include in the final documentation. However, BIAT discloses the use of Rhapsody to generate the documentary fragments that one desires to include in the final documentation (pages 1-2: Here, Rhapsody is used to provide support for automatic code generation from a UML model). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined BIAT with I-Logix,

since it would have allowed a user to automatically generate software code from a UML model.

As per dependent claim 14, I-Logix, Ferrucci, and BAIT disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 13, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. BAIT discloses wherein the documentary fragments are inserted into a document opened in a text processing (pages 1-2: Here, text of the UML document is processed to be included in the automatically generated code). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined BAIT with I-Logix, since it would have allowed for the automatic inclusion of UML text data within the generated code.

As per dependent claim 15, I-Logix and Ferrucci disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. I-Logix fails to specifically discloses wherein the "RHAPSODY-DOC" tool is used with "DOORS" for the generation of the documentary fragments processing information around the requirements, then the combination of "RHAPSODY-DOC" with a text processing so as to insert these DOORS fragments and architecture its final document. However, BAIT discloses wherein the "RHAPSODY-DOC" tool is used with "DOORS" for the generation of the documentary fragments processing information around the requirements, then the combination of "RHAPSODY-DOC" with a text processing so as to insert these DOORS fragments and architecture its final document (pages 1-2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have

combined BAIT with I-Logix, since it would have allowed a user to interface between the UML model and other model languages, such as XMI.

As per dependent claim 16, I-Logix and Ferrucci disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. I-Logix fails to specifically disclose wherein the "RHAPSODY-DOC" tool is used with "DOORS" and a text processing for the document generation. However, BAIT discloses wherein the "RHAPSODY-DOC" tool is used with "DOORS" and a text processing for the document generation (pages 1-2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined BAIT with I-Logix, since it would have allowed a user to interface between the UML model and other model languages, such as XMI.

7.      Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over I-Logix and Ferrucci and further in view of Tice et al. (US 2003/0182163, filed 25 February 2002).

As per dependent claim 17, I-Logix and Ferrucci disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein. I-Logix fails to specifically disclose wherein the final documentation comprises manual free text included between the fragments generated. However, Tice discloses wherein the final documentation comprises manual free text included between the fragments generated (paragraph 0149). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Tice with I-Logix, since it would have

allowed a user to provide supplemental information in addition to the automatically

generated documentation.


8.      Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over I-Logix

and Ferrucci, and further in view of Pastor et al. (US 6681383, filed 4 April 2000,

hereafter Pastor).

        As per dependent claim 18, I-Logix and Ferrucci disclose the limitations similar to

those in claim 10, and the same rejection is incorporated herein.  I-Logix fails to

specifically disclose filtering of data.  However, Pastor discloses filtering of data (column

9, lines 28-54).  It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the applicant's invention to have combined Pastor with I-Logix, since it would have

allowed for a user to specify preconditions to be satisfied prior to performing actions.



                                  *Response to Arguments*

9.      Applicant's arguments filed 23 March 2011 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

        The applicant's initial argument is based upon the belief that the prior art fails to

teach generating of documentary fragments of the model with a requirements

management tool (pages 2-3).  The examiner respectfully disagrees.  I-Logix discloses

a management tool, specifically Rhapsody Reporter (page 1, paragraph 2).  Rhapsody

report allows for the selection of design components, or document fragments, for

generating documentation (page 1, paragraph 2). Customized documentation is
generated via the Rhapsody environment by outputting the selected design
components, or document fragments, into a plurality of document types, including RFT,
HTML, Framemaker, and Microsoft Word formats (page 1, paragraph 2). For this
reason, this argument is not persuasive.

The applicant further argues that the prior art fails to disclose selecting of the
model including the documentary information and of the generator of documentary
fragments (pages 4-5). The examiner respectfully disagrees. I-Logix discloses
selection design components, in the form of UML diagrams and code (page 1,
paragraph 2). The selected components including the customized documentation
comprises document fragments, which are placed within the output format document
(page 1, paragraph 2). For this reason, this argument is not persuasive.


10.     Applicant's additional arguments have been considered but are moot in view of
the new ground(s) of rejection.


## *Conclusion*

11.     The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to
applicant's disclosure

De La Huerga (US 6272505, patented 7 August 2001)

Braun et al. (US 7231597, filed 7 October 2002)

Cossey et al. (US 2004/0070622, filed 15 October 2002)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KYLE STORK whose telephone number is (571)272-4130. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Kyle R Stork/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178